



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,591	08/14/2001	Louis L. Hsu	728-216 (YOR9-2001-0444 U)	9143
7590	01/12/2005		EXAMINER	
Paul J. Farrell, Esq. DILWORTH & BARRESE LLP 333 Earle Ovington Boulevard Uniondale, NY 11553			NGUYEN, DANNY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/929,591	HSU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Danny Nguyen	2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2-6,8-11,13-16 and 18-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2-6,8-11,13-16 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The final rejections are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Itoh et al (USPN 5,388,084). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-5, 9-11, 13-15, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keeth (USPN 5,946,257) in view of Itoh et al (USPN 5,388,084).

Regarding claims 2, 9-11, 19-22, Keeth discloses an integrated circuit system (see fig. 1 and 8) having a plurality of macros (memory arrays 801(1) to 801(8)), the integrated circuit comprises an external voltage supply input (the external supply input voltage Vcc) configured to supply an external voltage to the integrated circuit; and a plurality of internal voltage supply generators (e.g. 804 (1) to 804 (8)), each connected to a respective macro and configured for receiving the external voltage for generating an internal voltage supply for operating its respective macro (e.g. col. 9, lines 55-60), and each of the plurality of internal voltage supply generators including at least one reference supply (such as 1004 shown fig. 10) for generating the voltage level, an enable register (col. 4, lines 50-53). Keeth does not disclose the generator as claimed. Itoh discloses a memory device (fig. 5) comprises a voltage limiter (21) for controlling the voltage level, an oscillator (19), a charge pump (20). It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2836

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the voltage generator of Keeth to incorporate the voltage limiter, an oscillator, and a charge pump as disclosed by Itoh in order to provide a stable operating voltage level in memory device.

Regarding claim 3, Keeth discloses the external voltage is greater than the internal voltage (the internal supply voltage is approximately one half of the external supply voltage Vcc, see col. 9, lines 9, line 58).

Regarding claims 4, 13, 21, Keeth discloses a scan-chain formed by a chain of scannable register latches storing fuse information and switch enable/disable signal (see col. 4, lines 53-57).

Regarding claims 5, 14, 15, Keeth discloses each of the plurality of internal voltage generators comprises a reference voltage generator (1004) for generating and providing a reference voltage for driving at least one voltage generator (see fig. 10).

3. Claims 8, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keeth in view of Itoh, and Sher et al. (USPN 6,496,027). Keeth and Itoh disclose all limitations of claim 10 as discussed above, but Keeth does not disclose an oscillator and a feedback voltage provided from the charge pump. Sher et al. disclose a voltage supply generator (26) comprises an oscillator (130) and a feedback voltage (see fig. 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Keeth and Itoh to incorporate an

Art Unit: 2836

oscillator with a feedback voltage to produce the internal supply voltage to the memory arrays (col. 6, lines 5-19).

4. Claims 6, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keeth in view of Itoh, and Hsu et al (USPN 6,343,044). Keeth discloses all limitations of claims 1 and 20, except for having a substrate bias level generator, a negative word line level voltage generator, and a boosted high level voltage generator. Hsu discloses a memory (e.g. fig. 3) comprises a substrate bias level generator (Vbb), a negative word line level voltage generator (Vwl), and a boosted high level voltage generator (Vpp) (see col. 1, lines 10-42 and col. 5, lines 45-46). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the system of Keeth and Itoh to incorporate a Vbb generator, a Vwl generator, and a Vpp generator as taught by Hsuan in order to reduce cell leakage and improve the retention time (e.g. col. 1, lines 15-16).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Danny Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)-272-2054. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus can be reached on (571)-272-2058. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2836

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DN

DN

1/10/2005



BRIAN SIRCUS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800